

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

KYO HAK CHU,

Plaintiff,

v.

ZECHSAN BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT,
INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. [21-cv-00312-HSG](#)

**ORDER DENYING ADMINISTRATIVE
MOTION TO RELATE CASES**

Re: Dkt. No. 17

Before the Court is an administrative motion to consider whether the following cases filed in this District are related to the above-captioned matter:

CASE NAME	CASE NO.	DATE FILED	JUDGE
<i>Chu v. Furla (U.S.A.), Inc. et al</i>	3:21-cv-00195-LB	January 8, 2021	Magistrate Judge Laurel Beeler
<i>Chu v. L'Oreal USA S/D, Inc. et al</i>	3:21-cv-00471-EMC	January 20, 2021	Judge Edward M. Chen
<i>Chu v. Atlantic Richfield Company</i>	4:21-cv-00688-HSG	January 8, 2021	Judge Haywood S. Gilliam, Jr.
<i>Chu v. Pat Kuleto Restaurant Development & Management Company</i>	3:21-cv-01426-SK	February 26, 2021	Magistrate Judge Sallie Kim

//

//

//

//

//


//

Under Civil Local Rule 3-12(a), “[a]n action is related to another when: (1) [t]he actions concern substantially the same parties, property, transaction or event; and (2) [i]t appears likely that there will be an unduly burdensome duplication of labor and expense or conflicting results if the cases are conducted before different Judges.” Civ. L.R. 3-12(a). Defendant contends that the above-captioned action and the four other cases “require determination of substantially the same questions of fact and law” because they “involve the same Plaintiff and concern the same alleged wrongful occurrences, namely, violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, and violations of the Unruh Civil Rights Act.” *See* Dkt. No. 17 at 3.

The Court disagrees. As the captions indicate, the five cases Defendant seeks to relate all concern different defendants and therefore do not involve the same parties. Defendant also provides no basis to conclude that the actions concern substantially the same property, transaction, or event, and the Court sees none given the diverse types of businesses represented among the defendants. Therefore, to the extent Defendant moves to relate any higher-numbered cases to the above-captioned matter, the motion is **DENIED**.¹

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 10/27/2021


HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.
United States District Judge

¹ Defendant’s request to relate *Chu v. Furla (U.S.A.), Inc.* to the above-captioned matter is improper under Civil Local Rule 3-12(b), which requires Defendant to file an administrative motion to relate cases in the lowest-numbered case it contends is related. Civ. L.R. 3-12(b).